



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2024

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/24/3340239

16 Hartcliffe View, Thurgoland, Barnsley S35 7BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kennedy against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/0874.
 - The development proposed is a single storey glazed garden room extension to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey glazed garden room extension to side elevation at 16 Hartcliffe View, Thurgoland, Barnsley S35 7BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/0874 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No DL827 01 and Drawing No 01 Elevation & Plan Drawing.

Preliminary Matters

2. I used the appellant name, address and application description as originally stated on the planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings facing Hartcliffe View. The site occupies an elevated corner plot of a residential cul-de-sac, with its side elevation facing Roper Lane. Whilst properties on Hartcliffe View have a traditional appearance and are constructed from stone, house types and materials, including those used on extensions and conservatories in the wider area are mixed.
5. The proposal for a dark grey aluminium glazed lean-to extension on the side of the property facing Roper Lane, would not be of the same materials, colour and texture as to the existing house. Nor would the glazing be of a similar form or proportion. However, I am of the view that the more modern, simple, glazed

extension nonetheless respects the dwelling through its small scale, low profile and the obvious contrasting form assists in giving the extension a modern, lightweight appearance. The use of a darker aluminium frame would suitably tie with the dark roof, and those of other properties in the area.

6. The ground floor part of the building is relatively well screened by a neighbouring garage, boundary fencing, outbuildings and hedges to the side and rear. Only the upper most part would be visible above these features. Whilst it would be possible to see the extension from the front of the property, it would not appear in wide ranging or prominent views from this perspective. The extension is set far back from the front and rear of the property so that it would not appear obtrusive and would be a relatively discrete addition, that would not interfere or harm the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area. The proposal would accord with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (adopted January 2019), which seeks to ensure that development comprises high quality design. Notwithstanding that the materials do not comply with the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations (adopted May 2019), it does not conflict with its general principles to ensure development is of a scale and design harmonious to the existing building.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a time limit for commencement and a plans condition. These are necessary in the interests of certainty and enforceability. A materials condition is not required, as these are specified on the drawings.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the Development Plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR